

4-1-2001

Metro Policy Advisory Committee: Parks Subcommittee, Final Report

Metro (Or.)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_metro



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Metro (Or.), "Metro Policy Advisory Committee: Parks Subcommittee, Final Report" (2001). *Metro Collection*. Paper 14.
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_metro/14

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Metro Collection by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PARKS SUBCOMMITTEE

**FINAL REPORT
For Presentation to MPAC
April 4, 2001**

MPAC Parks Subcommittee

Chuck Becker, Mayor of Gresham
Richard Kidd, Mayor of Forest Grove
Mark Knudsen, Chair of Board of Directors of
Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Doug Neeley, City Councilor of Oregon City
Becky Read, citizen of Washington County
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer of the Metro Council
Jim Zehren, citizen of Multnomah County, Chair of Subcommittee

MAJOR IDEAS IN THIS REPORT

- Parks and related lands and facilities are an essential element of the urban form of our neighborhoods, communities, and region. They constitute a critical component of livability that is of increasing importance to our citizens as development and redevelopment continue apace in our metropolitan area.
- Metro's adopted *Regional Growth Concept* and related regional policies well acknowledge the critical role of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities—at the neighborhood, community, city, county, and regional levels—in our metropolitan area's quality of life. However, Metro and its local government partners have not taken the steps needed for the parks-related elements of our region's growth management policies to be adequately implemented.
- The Metro Council, in collaboration with MPAC and local governments, should act to bring parks and related lands and facilities up to par with such important regional policy areas as land use, transportation, and environmental protection. Failure to do so will place citizen support of the *Regional Growth Concept*—and perhaps Metro itself—increasingly in jeopardy.
- The \$135.6 million Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure passed by the region's voters in 1995 has resulted in important additions to the regional and local natural areas in public ownership in this metropolitan area. For the full spectrum of regional and local parks and related lands and facilities to be acquired, developed, operated, and maintained as needed for livability, however, additional capital and noncapital resources are required.
- Local park providers in the region face chronic constraints in securing adequate, stable funding for local parks and related lands and facilities. Metro should expand its mission to assist its local partners in this policy area in a variety of ways, most importantly by providing technical and financial assistance. In so doing, Metro should respect local prerogatives.
- Metro should continue to develop the Regional System of natural areas and trails, irrespective of their ownership. To do so will require substantial additional monies to fund development and operation of the properties purchased with the 1995 bond proceeds and acquisition of additional properties, consistent with the vision set out in the *Greenspaces Master Plan*.
- The Metro Council should mobilize the regional community in support of a major new regional effort to fund and otherwise deliver the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities needed to effectively implement the *Regional Growth Concept* and to maintain and enhance livability in the metropolitan area. This region's voters strongly supported the 1995 bond measure, and last November Seattle's voters soundly passed a new \$200 million parks and greenspaces levy. It is time for our regional community to take this next major step in order to secure our quality of life and that of future generations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Subcommittee Creation and Charge | 1 |
| Subcommittee Membership | 1 |
| Subcommittee Staff Support | 2 |
| Subcommittee Meetings | 2 |
| Key Definition: "Parks and Related Lands and Facilities" | 2 |
| FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS | 3 |
| A. LEGAL SETTING AND EXISTING POLICY | 3 |
| A.1 State Law | 3 |
| A.2 <i>Metro Charter</i> | 3 |
| A.3 <i>RUGGOs and Regional Growth Concept</i> | 3 |
| A.4 Chapter 3 of <i>Regional Framework Plan</i> | 3 |
| A.5 Urban Reserves Language | 5 |
| A.6 <i>UGMFP</i> | 5 |
| A.7 Metro Council Resolution 97-2562B | 5 |
| A.8 October 2000 Update of <i>Urban Growth Report</i> | 5 |
| A.9 3,700 Acre Projection | 6 |
| A.10 Local Park System Master Plans | 6 |
| A.11 Local Parks Level of Service Standards | 6 |
| A.12 Metro Legal Authority | 7 |
| A.13 Measure 7 and <i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i> | 7 |
| B. STATUS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS AND POLICY-DEVELOPMENT WORK | 8 |
| B.1 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure | 8 |
| B.2 Focus on Regional-Scale | 8 |
| B.3 Regional Parks Inventory | 8 |
| B.4 Lack of Comparative Data | 8 |
| B.5 Uncertainty of Amount of Unfunded Capital Needs | 9 |
| B.6 Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee | 9 |
| B.7 GTAC and Its February 2000 Report | 9 |
| B.8 Regional Goal 5 Inventory | 10 |
| B.9 Parks-Related Urban Issues Addressed by Parks Professionals and Agencies | 11 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| C. | EXISTING FUNDING APPROACHES | 11 |
| C.1 | 1995 Bond Measure | 11 |
| C.2 | Local Property Taxes and General Revenues | 11 |
| C.3 | Local Parks SDCs | 12 |
| C.4 | Local Parks SDCs on Commercial Development | 13 |
| C.5 | Enterprise Revenues | 13 |
| C.6 | Developer Dedication of Land | 13 |
| C.7 | De Facto Regional Parks | 13 |
| C.8 | Partnering | 13 |
| C.9 | Parks Foundation and Gifts | 13 |
| C.10 | City of Ashland Niche Tax For Parks | 14 |
| C.11 | Funding of Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department | 14 |
| C.12 | State and Federal Grant Programs | 14 |
| D. | NEED FOR ACTION | 15 |
| D.1 | Important But Limited Impact of 1995 Bond Measure | 15 |
| D.2 | 3,700 Acres Needed to Be Set Aside From 1998-2017 to Maintain "Status Quo" in Region | 15 |
| D.3 | Citizen Demand for "Green" | 17 |
| D.4 | Public Plazas for Urban Centers | 18 |
| D.5 | Critical Component of Livability | 18 |
| D.6 | Documented Economic and Other Benefits | 18 |
| D.7 | Cooperation and Coordination of Parks Providers | 18 |
| D.8 | Aid to Meeting Environmental and Habitat Constraints | 18 |
| D.9 | Chronic Lack of Adequate Resources | 19 |
| D.10 | Limited Local Funding | 19 |
| D.11 | Limited Regional Parks and Greenspaces Operating Budgets . | 19 |
| D.12 | Lack of Funding for Development of Properties Acquired With 1995 Bond Proceeds | 20 |
| D.13 | Cost of Developing Criteria and Goals Needed to Assess Capital Needs | 20 |
| D.14 | Potential Impact of Measure 7 | 20 |
| D.15 | Need for Concerted Action | 20 |
| E. | TRADEOFFS/CHOICES/POSSIBILITIES | 20 |
| E.1 | Ongoing Central Role For Local Parks Providers | 20 |
| E.2 | Reallocation of Other Public Resources Not Feasible | 21 |
| E.3 | Competing Perspectives on Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals | 21 |
| E.4 | Optional Applications of Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals | 22 |
| E.5 | Identification of "Regional" Irrespective of Ownership | 22 |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| E.6 | Caveat Regarding Identification of "Regional" Irrespective of Ownership | 22 |
| E.7 | User and Visitation Surveys of "Regional" Parks and Related Lands and Facilities | 23 |
| E.8 | Parks Land Acquisition Lending Bank | 23 |
| E.9 | Local Parks Providers' Use of Metro's Bond Rating | 23 |
| E.10 | New Regional Funding | 24 |
| E.11 | Excise Tax on Solid Waste Tip Fee | 24 |
| E.12 | Regional Funding Options | 24 |
| E.13 | 1995 Bond Measure Success | 25 |
| E.14 | November 2000 Parks Levy in Seattle | 25 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | | 27 |
| GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS (1.1-1.7) | | 27 |
| SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS | | 29 |
| 2. | Affirmation and Furtherance of Existing Regional Policies and Programs (2.1) | 29 |
| 3. | A New <i>UGMFP</i> Parks Title, Modified Metro Department Roles, and A New Metro Advisory Committee (3.1-3.3) | 31 |
| 4. | Improved Information Regarding Parks and Related Lands and Facilities (4.1-4.5) | 32 |
| 5. | Increased Regional Funding for Parks and Related Lands and Facilities (5.1-5.5) | 34 |

EXHIBITS

INTRODUCTION

Subcommittee Creation and Charge

The MPAC Parks Subcommittee was created by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee ("MPAC") of Metro on September 20, 1999. As subsequently articulated by the Subcommittee and approved by MPAC, the purpose of the Subcommittee was to analyze and make recommendations to MPAC regarding the following:

1. The effectiveness of Metro's parks inventory system completed in late 1999 to provide on-going information and guidance to MPAC and the Metro Council regarding the numbers, types, locations, and status of improvements of local and regional parks and natural areas within the metropolitan area.
2. The need for and nature of regional "standards", "goals", "measures", or other idealized indicators of the extent of local parks and natural areas within the metropolitan area, in the context of the *Regional Growth Concept*, irrespective of whether such indicators be merely advisory or otherwise.
3. The need for and nature of a new local parks and natural areas title to be added to the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*. The subject matter of any such new title would be independent of the subject matter addressed in, or being addressed regarding, existing Title 3 of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

During the course of the Subcommittee's research and deliberations, additional relevant issues were identified and subsequently addressed in this report. Such additional topics include funding for the region's parks and related lands and facilities, the status of capital and non-capital parks-related needs, and current parks-related programs and policy-development work of Metro and its local government partners.

Subcommittee Membership

Chuck Becker, Mayor of Gresham
Richard Kidd, Mayor of Forest Grove
Mark Knudsen, Chair of Board of Directors of Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Doug Neeley, City Councilor of Oregon City
Becky Read, citizen of Washington County
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer of the Metro Council
Jim Zehren, citizen of Multnomah County, Chair of Subcommittee

The Subcommittee also acknowledges the early contributions of Dan Saltzman, City Commissioner of Portland, and (former MPAC member) Chuck Peterson, Chair of Board of Directors of Oak Lodge Sanitary District.

Subcommittee Staff Support

Charlie Ciecko, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director
Heather Nelson Kent, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Manager
Elaine Wilkerson, former Growth Management Director
Mark Turpell, Growth Management Manager
Ken Helm, Office of General Counsel
John Houser, Metro Council Analyst
Paul Couey, Metro Executive Office (former employee)
Karen Withrow, Metro Executive Office
Cathy Kirchner, Metro Executive Office

The Subcommittee also acknowledges the participation and contributions of representatives of various local park providers and interest groups, including but not limited to Jim Sjulín and John Sewell of Portland Parks and Recreation, Steve Bosak of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, and Mike Houck of the Audubon Society of Portland.

Subcommittee Meetings

The Subcommittee has met a total of 18 times, first on September 22, 1999 and last on February 14, 2001. This final version of the Subcommittee's report follows twelve draft versions.

Key Definition: "Parks and Related Lands and Facilities"

The subject matter of this report presents certain basic terminological complications. The Subcommittee is named the "MPAC Parks Subcommittee", but the subject studied by the Subcommittee and addressed in this report involves more than "parks" per se. Depending on the context, that subject matter includes not only "parks" but also "natural areas", "open spaces", "greenspaces", "trails", "green ways", "recreation lands and facilities", "public plazas and town squares", and similar such lands and facilities that are publicly-owned or dedicated to public use. For ease of reference, this report arbitrarily uses the generic term "parks and related lands and facilities" to refer to that full spectrum of lands and facilities.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. LEGAL SETTING AND EXISTING POLICY

A.1 State Law. The *Statewide Planning Goals* of the State of Oregon make virtually no references to "parks" per se and do not require local governments to take any specific actions to actually provide parks and related lands and facilities within their jurisdictions. *Statewide Planning Goal 8 (Recreational Needs)* requires local governments to "satisfy the recreational needs" of their citizens. *Statewide Planning Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services)* references "recreational facilities and services" in identifying types of "Urban Facilities and Services", but omits "recreational facilities and services" from those facilities to be described in statutorily required "Public Facilities Plans" to be prepared in conjunction with local comprehensive plans. Oregon Administrative Rule ("OAR") 660-034-0040 adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission ("LCDC") authorizes local park providers to prepare local parks master plans and local jurisdictions to amend their comprehensive plans to implement such local parks master plans.

A.2 Metro Charter. The *Metro Charter* requires that the *Regional Framework Plan* address, in addition to eight other categories of growth management and land use concerns, "parks, open spaces and recreational facilities".

A.3 RUGGOs and Regional Growth Concept. The *Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives ("RUGGOs")* and the *Regional Growth Concept* contain numerous provisions indicating the importance of establishing, monitoring, and achieving numeric goals for the spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities from local to regional in scale. A summary of such provisions is attached as Exhibit 1.

A.4 Chapter 3 of Regional Framework Plan. Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 2, includes key ideas and represents existing Metro policy regarding parks and related lands and facilities, at both the regional and local levels.

A.4.1 Regional. The regional parks and related lands and facilities policies ("goals and objectives") set out in Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan* include the following key sections:

- (i) Section 3.1 relates to an inventory and identification of "regionally significant parks, natural areas, open spaces, vacant lands, trails and greenways."
- (ii) Section 3.2 relates to continued development of a "Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways . . . to achieve the following objectives:

- (a) protect the region's biodiversity;
 - (b) provide citizens the opportunity for, primarily, natural resource dependant recreation and education;
 - (c) contribute to the protection of air and water quality; and
 - (d) provide natural buffers and connections between communities."
- (iii) Section 3.3 relates to management of "the publicly-owned portion of the regional system of parks, natural areas, open spaces, trails and greenways" so as "to protect fish, wildlife, and botanic values and to provide, primarily, natural resource dependant recreational and educational opportunities."
 - (iv) Section 3.4 relates to the protection, establishment, and management of a "regional trails system" so as to "provide access to publicly owned parks, natural areas, opens paces, and greenways, where appropriate."

A.4.2 Local. The community and neighborhood parks and related lands and facilities policies ("goals and objectives") set out in Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan* include the following key sections:

- (i) Section 3.5.1 recognizes that "local governments shall remain responsible for the planning and provision of community and neighborhood parks, local open spaces, natural areas, sports fields, recreation centers, trails, and associated programs within their jurisdictions."
- (ii) Section 3.5.2 requires that Metro, pending its adoption of a "functional plan" for parks, encourage local governments to adopt specific measurable, numeric "level of service standards for provision of parks, natural areas, trails, and recreation facilities in their local comprehensive plans."
- (iii) Section 3.5.7 requires that urban reserve master plans "demonstrate that planning requirements for the acquisition and protection of adequate land to meet or exceed locally adopted levels of service standards for the provision of public parks, natural areas, trails, and recreation facilities . . . will be adopted in the local comprehensive plans", such that no urban reserve areas are

brought into the region's urban growth boundary ("UGB") if this demonstration is not made.¹

- (iv) Section 3.5.8 requires that Metro, in cooperation with local governments, adopt a "functional plan" that "establishes the criteria which local governments shall address in adopting locally determined 'level of service standards'" and "region-wide goals for the provision of parks and open space in the various urban design types identified in the 2040 regional growth concept". The functional plan is to apply to all lands currently within the UGB and in "the urban reserves within Metro's jurisdiction when urban reserve concept plans are approved."

A.5 Urban Reserves Language. Given the abandonment of the designation of urban reserves and the current approach to master planning and development of lands to be added to the UGB, the language of Sections 3.5.7 and 3.5.8 of the *Regional Framework Plan* (relating to parks within urban reserves) is outdated.

A.6 UGMFP. Although the existing *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* ("UGMFP") includes regional goals, standards, or performance requirements for local governments to meet regarding (1) local housing density, (2) local employment density, (3) local parking, (4) local urban streambeds and floodplain management areas, (5) local retail space in employment and industrial areas, (6) local street design and connectivity, and (7) local transportation system performance, it does not include any regional goals, standards, or performance requirements for local governments to meet regarding local parks and related lands and facilities.

A.7 Metro Council Resolution 97-2562B. In 1997, the Metro Council adopted a policy (set out in Resolution No. 97-2562B, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 3) of allowing exceptions to local jurisdictions' housing, employment, and other targets established in the *UGMFP* if the particular local jurisdictions can demonstrate their inability to meet the targets due to their actions to protect "environmentally sensitive lands" from development. The "environmentally sensitive lands" referenced in Resolution No. 97-2465B include "parks, open space, recreational trails, and other sensitive areas . . . even if they include what has been classified as 'buildable' in Metro's [buildable lands] inventory."

A.8 October 2000 Update of *Urban Growth Report*. In October 2000, the Metro Council adopted an update to the *Urban Growth Report* (by means of Ordinance No. 00-871A) which concluded that adequate buildable land is available within the

¹ See Finding and Conclusion A.5.

current UGB² to enable local jurisdictions to achieve their *UGMFP* housing and employment targets between 1998 and 2017 *even after 3,700 acres are excluded from the buildable land inventory to account for acquisition or other dedication of land for additional parks and related lands and facilities.*³ Accordingly, local jurisdictions' efforts to acquire or otherwise dedicate additional land for parks and related lands and facilities should not significantly diminish their ability to meet their *UGMFP* housing and employment targets unless and until those jurisdictions have acquired or dedicated more than their respective shares of 3,700 acres of the region's otherwise buildable land.⁴

A.9 3,700 Acre Projection. It is important to understand and keep in mind that the 3,700 acres of land for parks and related lands and facilities discussed in Finding and Conclusion A.8 is nothing more than an assumption—a projection of a future outcome—without any legal force or effect to cause any acreage to actually be acquired or dedicated for parks and related lands and facilities in the region.

A.10 Local Park System Master Plans. While most local park providers in the region have established park system master plans for their respective jurisdictional areas, not all of these master plans have been incorporated into local comprehensive plans.

A.11 Local Parks Level of Service Standards. Only a few local park providers in the region have established and formally adopted comprehensive level of service standards for parks and related lands and facilities located within their jurisdictions. Most local analyses of park needs are performed to support adoption of local park system development charges ("SDC's"). While adequate for those purposes,

² The buildable land inventory analyzed by Metro staff in its *Urban Growth Report 2000 Update* (July 5, 2000) includes 3,500 acres (18,100 dwelling units) added to the UGB in December 1998 and 384 acres (2,100 dwelling units) added to the UGB in December 1999.

³ Subject to certain technical qualifications, this 3,700-acre figure was determined by assuming that approximately the same percentage of buildable land developed within the UGB between 1998 and 2017 will be acquired or otherwise dedicated to parks and related lands and facilities as the percentage of existing developed land within the UGB that is currently in public ownership or otherwise dedicated to parks and related lands and facilities.

⁴ The definition of "parks" used by Metro staff for purposes of the buildable land inventory is an expansive one—including, for example, not only parks and related lands and facilities as that term is used in this report but also cemeteries, private golf courses, school play fields, fairgrounds and stadiums, and certain other miscellaneous public lands. Nonetheless, the 3,700-acre figure appears to be an appropriate one to use to approximate the need for parks and related lands and facilities into the future because the expansive definition allows for enhancements of service levels within areas of the region that currently are under-served by parks and related lands and facilities.

such analyses typically are insufficient to establish long-term needs across the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within local jurisdictions.

A.12 Metro Legal Authority. It appears that Metro has authority under state statutes, the *Statewide Planning Goals*, state regulations, and the *Metro Charter* to require local governments to amend their comprehensive plans to require certain level of service standards for parks and related lands and facilities.⁵ It follows that Metro also likely has authority to merely require local governments to "consider" the impacts of new residential developments on the adequacy of local parks—including how well the proposed developments would be served by existing local parks and by those to be added by the developments. However, in Section 3.5.8 of the *Regional Framework Plan*, Metro has chosen not to fully exercise its legal authority in this area. In Section 3.5.8, Metro requires the development of a functional plan (yet to be developed) which is to establish "criteria" that local governments are only required to "address" in adopting their own local level of service standards. The functional plan also is to establish "region-wide goals for the provision of parks and open space in [the] various urban design types", but Section 3.5.8 does not require local governments or their level of service standards to meet or conform to the goals.

A.13 Measure 7 and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*. If Metro did require the region's local governments to include in their local comprehensive plans a requirement that certain level of service standards for parks and related lands and facilities be met, the local governments could face at least two significant legal obstacles if they attempted to implement Metro's requirement by making compliance with the level of service standards a condition of development approval. First, if Measure 7 amending the

⁵ It is true that Oregon Revised Statute ("ORS") 197.712(2)(e), *Statewide Planning Goal 11*, and OAR 660-011-0005(1) all mention only "sewer", "water", and "transportation" when describing the public facilities to be included in the "public facilities plans" required to be prepared in conjunction with local comprehensive plans. However, the omission of parks and related lands and facilities from these statutory and regulatory references to "public facilities" does not in itself mean that Metro—or a local government—could not legally make the adequacy of parks and related lands and facilities a condition of development approvals. This interpretation of Oregon law is bolstered by the fact that ORS 195.110 (requiring each local jurisdiction containing a high growth school district to include a "school facilities plan" as an element of the local comprehensive plan) includes the following provision:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of state or local law, school capacity shall not be the sole basis for the approval or denial of any residential development application, unless the application involves changes to the local governmental comprehensive plan or land use regulations." ORS 195.110(10).

The absence of a similar provision in state statutes barring the adequacy of parks and related lands and facilities from being used as the basis for approval or denial of a development application suggests that such an approach is valid under Oregon's statewide land use system. For this and other reasons mentioned, Metro likely has the legal authority to require local governments to amend their comprehensive plans to require that certain Metro-prescribed level of services standards or other goals concerning parks and related lands and facilities be met.

Oregon Constitution as passed by the state's voters on November 7, 2000 is upheld and not repealed or modified, any development approval denied on the basis of the inadequacy of parks or related lands and facilities likely would result in a Measure 7 claim for compensation. Second, the dictates of *Dolan v. City of Tigard* would require that there be a rational and proportional nexus between the condition of approval and the impact of the proposed development on parks and related lands and facilities. If these obstacles somehow could be overcome, however, local governments likely could legally require a property owner or developer to dedicate land for parks and related lands and facilities, or money in lieu thereof, as a condition of development.

B. STATUS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS AND POLICY-DEVELOPMENT WORK

B.1 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure. Passage and implementation of the 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure is generally viewed as the single most popular thing Metro has done. Although there have been recent discussions of those involved in the 1995 bond measure regarding a return to the region's voters with a new measure, no conclusions have been reached as to the specific program to be funded or the timing of the effort. Nonetheless, all involved in the 1995 effort view it as only a first step in creating a Regional System of parks and related lands and facilities that is intended to grow along with the region's population.

B.2 Focus on Regional-Scale. The Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department's current programs and pending *Greenspaces Protection Plan* are primarily focused on the continued development of a "Regional System" of regional-scale parks, natural areas, open spaces, trails, and greenways and not on development of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the region—including parks and related lands and facilities at the neighborhood, community, city, county, and regional levels. In taking this approach, the Department believes it is following the policy direction set out in both the *Greenspaces Master Plan* and Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*.

B.3 Regional Parks Inventory. In late 1999, Metro completed a new parks inventory of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area. The inventory is scheduled for an update every five years, subject to funding availability. School sites have since been added to the inventory—irrespective of whether such school sites are or will remain available for parks-related uses. Two important limitations of the parks inventory are: (i) the data are based on each parcel being coded as one discrete type of park or facility, even if the parcel is multi-functional in nature, and (ii) the data are not aggregated by urban design type.

B.4 Lack of Comparative Data. Notwithstanding Metro's completion of its parks inventory, with respect to the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities we as a region do not have data to document whether we are doing better than, about the same as, or worse than we were five, ten, or twenty years ago. Even

assuming that we are simply trying to maintain the level of service that we historically had at any given time, we do not have data to document whether we are out in front of growth, are just keeping up, or are falling behind. We do not have data to document whether we are doing better than other comparable regions, about the same, or worse. There is no money budgeted to obtain this kind of data, except as may become available through the five-year updates of Metro's parks inventory.

B.5 Uncertainty of Amount of Unfunded Capital Needs. Given the absence of any regionally-adopted level of service criteria, goals, or other standards or benchmarks for the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area, it currently is not possible to describe in dollar terms the region's unfunded capital needs for parks and related lands and facilities in the same way that it is possible to describe the region's unfunded capital needs for other public facilities, such as for transportation.

B.6 Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee. Metro's Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee is a citizen committee that advises the Metro Council, Executive Officer, and Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department regarding Metro's regional parks and greenspaces program. Although the Committee has provided valuable advice and has particularly played a significant role in helping make the implementation of the 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure as successful as it has been, the Committee has not focused on the kind of broad regional policy issues relating to the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities that are the subject of this report.

B.7 GTAC and Its February 2000 Report. Metro's Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee ("GTAC") is a committee of local parks and natural area professionals and representatives of related non-profit organizations that advises the Metro Council, MPAC, and the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department regarding implementation of Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan* and the *Greenspaces Master Plan*. In February 2000, after an 18-month effort to address the mandates of Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*, GTAC approved a report prepared by a subcommittee entitled *Level of Service Standards, Criteria and Guidelines for Local Park Providers*, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 4. Key aspects of and information provided by this GTAC report are as follows:

B.7.1 The report outlines criteria and a process for local park providers to follow in adopting comprehensive level of service standards within their own jurisdictions. It provides definitions, classifications, and various types and sources of measures and standards, so as to provide a common "language" and approach for local jurisdictions to follow.

B.7.2 The report does not recommend any specific parks level of service standards to be adopted or considered by Metro or local jurisdictions. The report

also does not expressly resolve the role of Metro, if any, in the development of local level of service standards. However, the report recommends that local jurisdictions identify and adopt their own level of service standards.

B.7.3 The report does not provide parks level of service "goals" for the various urban design types, as required by Section 3.5.8 of the *Regional Framework Plan*, citing lack of committee and staff resources to do so. However, the report expresses the committee's commitment to develop such goals if regional resources to do so are provided.

B.7.4 The report documents that of the 24 local park providers in the region (i) all but four have adopted parks SDCs (excluded are Clackamas County, Gladstone, Wood Village, and Washington County) but (ii) only six have formally adopted comprehensive parks level of service standards (included are North Clackamas Park and Recreation District, Milwaukie, Gresham, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, Hillsboro, and Lake Oswego).

B.7.5 The report's recommendations include the following:

- (i) Provide stable funding for (a) parks level of service goals for the urban design types, (b) parks level of service standards applied to Metro's regional parks inventory to establish benchmarks and standardized measures of progress, (c) grants to local park providers for development of level of service standards and master planning, and (d) acquisition and development of new parks and facilities;
- (ii) Provide incentives for comprehensive parks, recreation, and open space master plans;
- (iii) Encourage community involvement in development of park level of service standards and park system master plans;
- (iv) Encourage partnering between park providers and other jurisdictions and schools; and
- (v) Encourage Metro and local governments to adhere to the intent of Section 3.5.7 of the *Regional Framework Plan* by requiring planning and provision of parks and related lands and facilities as a condition of including land within the UGB.

B.8 Regional Goal 5 Inventory. Metro's Growth Management Department has initiated work on a regional Goal 5 inventory to identify "regionally significant riparian and upland natural resource areas." This work is relevant to the work of the

Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department on the Regional System described in the *Greenspaces Master Plan* and Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*.

B.9 Parks-Related Urban Issues Addressed by Parks Professionals and Agencies. Despite the crucial role that parks and related lands and facilities can and do play in creating the urban form and contributing to the livability of our neighborhoods, communities, and cities generally, and of our mainstreets, town centers, and regional centers more specifically, parks issues historically have been addressed primarily by parks professionals, departments, and special districts and only rarely by urban planning and development professionals and departments. This has been the case at all levels of government, including Metro. One explanation for this is the absence of any requirement under Oregon's land use planning laws that parks and related lands and facilities actually be provided.

C. EXISTING FUNDING APPROACHES

C.1 1995 Bond Measure. The 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure has produced some \$135.6 million in funds for new land and access to parks and related lands and facilities inside and outside of the UGB. However, as promised to the region's voters, use of the 1995 bond measure monies has been restricted to expenditures for acquisition of or improvements to *natural areas only*. Also, by law the bond monies cannot be used for operations and maintenance expenses. To date, the bond measure has enabled Metro to purchase more than 6,400 acres from over 200 willing sellers in "target areas" that were identified when the measure was submitted to the region's voters. Additionally, approximately 18 percent of the bond measure funds, or about \$25 million, has been or will be distributed to local park providers in the region for identified "local greenspace" acquisitions and related capital improvements. To date, approximately 75 such local projects have been completed at an estimated cost of \$18 million.

C.2 Local Property Taxes and General Revenues. Virtually all local park providers in the region are funded primarily with local property taxes, whether as part of local general revenues or in the form of capital bond levies, serial levies, or dedicated tax bases. Generating stable, adequate funding for local parks and related lands and facilities through such local property tax and general fund sources has proved to be problematic.

C.2.1 Local General Revenues. The simple, fundamental fact is that parks and related lands and facilities historically have tended to lose out in local government priority-setting to such competing needs as police, fire, schools, local transportation, and economic development. Absent a substantial change in local voters' priorities, there is no reason to believe that this age-old obstacle to funding parks with local general fund monies will be overcome. This problem is even more pronounced in jurisdictions where Measure 5's \$10 cap on the overall

non-school property tax rate has been reached (where Measure 5 "compression" is in effect).

C.2.2 Local Park Bonds. During the last decade, voters in the region's various cities and park and recreation districts have both approved and turned down bond measures for land acquisition and other capital improvements for local parks and related lands and facilities. Use of this funding mechanism is constrained by voters' reluctance to approve the increased property taxes required to pay off the bonds. This problem has been exacerbated by Oregon voters' general sensitivity to property tax increases in recent decades and by the Measure 50 double-majority requirement in off-year elections. Use of this funding mechanism also has the limitation of the bond proceeds not being legally available to pay for operations and maintenance costs.

C.2.3 Local Parks Serial Levies or Tax Bases. In the case of two local park providers, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District and North Clackamas Park and Recreation District, property taxes support parks programs and operations and maintenance expenses through special voter-approved serial levies or tax bases. However, more general use of this kind of mechanism to fund local parks and related lands and facilities is limited by the same factors that limit the effectiveness of the use of local general fund monies and local parks bonds. Such measures have to compete with local funding needs for police, fire, schools, local transportation, and economic development, they must overcome voters' resistance to property tax increases, their passage is made more problematic in jurisdictions that are in Measure 5 compression, and they face the Measure 50 double-majority requirement in off-year elections.

C.3 Local Parks SDCs. Despite widespread use of parks SDCs by local park providers in the region,⁶ there are limitations to the effectiveness of SDCs in paying for local parks and related lands and facilities: (i) they impact housing affordability (a partial solution to which is to exempt non-profit low and moderate income housing), (ii) the revenues they raise by law cannot be used to address pre-existing deficiencies in built-out areas, (iii) the revenues they raise by law cannot be used to pay for operations and maintenance costs, (iv) they produce only a small percentage—commonly as low as 20 to 30 percent—of the revenues actually needed to pay the costs of the park land and facilities needs resulting from the growth, and (v) local jurisdictions are subject to public criticism and potential development community backlash—and even lawsuits from development interests—if the rate of the parks SDC in a given jurisdiction is higher than the rates of parks SDCs in other jurisdictions in the region.

⁶ See Finding and Conclusion B.7.4.

C.4 Local Parks SDCs on Commercial Development. Of the local park providers in the region utilizing parks SDCs, only four—the cities of Durham, Hillsboro, Oregon City, and Wilsonville—apply their parks SDCs to commercial development in addition to residential development. At least two local park providers, Portland Parks and Recreation and the North Clackamas Park and Recreation District, have developed rates for parks SDCs on commercial development but have not implemented those charges because of opposition from the commercial development community.

C.5 Enterprise Revenues. Some of the region's local park providers, as well as the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, rely on enterprise revenues for a portion of their funding requirements. However, this approach is generally limited by a strong public sense that parks and related lands and facilities constitute public goods which should be provided free or for only a modest fee. Golf courses and similar recreation facilities can be exceptions, but even swimming pools usually are not self-financed because user fees covering the full cost would exceed their users' ability or willingness to pay.

C.6 Developer Dedication of Land. Local governments that assemble land for development or redevelopment have the opportunity to require dedication of land for parks as a condition of the sale of the land to the developer. Also, sometimes developers will voluntarily dedicate land for a park as part of the creation of a marketable development or in exchange for a credit against a park SDC. Such dedication of land for parks can be troublesome, however, because they often end up being the least desirable lands for parks and also because maintenance of small isolated parks within developments can be inefficient unless local landowners take responsibility for it.

C.7 De Facto Regional Parks. One factor contributing to local governments' inability to fully fund neighborhood, community, city, and county park needs is the fact that some "de facto" regional parks—those not owned or operated by Metro—are currently paid for entirely with local resources. A regional funding source could allow reallocation of those local resources to fund other local park needs.

C.8 Partnering. Many local park providers in the region partner with schools, other public agencies, and even non-profit organizations for parks and related lands and facilities. This approach has been shown to be workable and cost-effective. Similar partnering with private entities can also be effective, although access and liability issues can be barriers.

C.9 Parks Foundation and Gifts. At least one local park provider, Portland Parks and Recreation, is considering the creation of a foundation to seek, receive, and hold large-scale corporate and personal gifts. While this approach may have merit for large park providers, most smaller park providers lack the ability to create and sustain a successful foundation. In any event, such private fund raising generally should be

viewed as an alternative approach to paying for special park-related projects and not as a workable alternative to adequate, sustained public funding of parks and related lands and facilities.

C.10 City of Ashland Niche Tax For Parks. Of local parks providers in Oregon, only the City of Ashland appears to take a significantly different approach to funding acquisition of property for its parks and related lands and facilities. Restaurant expenditures in Ashland are subject to a special 1 percent tax which supports additions to that city's park system.

C.11 Funding of Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department. Except for its acquisition program (funding by the 1995 bond measure), the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department is reliant on an eclectic array of funding sources that include enterprise revenues, federal grants, recreational vehicle registration fees, and the Metro excise tax. All of these sources appear to be volatile and inadequate to meet the Department's current requirements, especially given Metro's growing greenspaces property portfolio.

C.12 State and Federal Grant Programs. Many local park providers and the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department compete for state and federal grants to support the capital expansion, renovation, or enhancement of their parks and related lands and facilities. Although these sources of financial assistance are important, they have their limitations. For example, many such sources require 50 percent or more in matching funds. Also, use of the funds is restricted to capital projects only (operations and maintenance cannot be funded) and the available resources are limited. Examples of these grant programs include:

- (i) Land and Water Conservation Fund
Source: federal off-shore oil leases; current year: \$858,000 (local parks statewide)
- (ii) State Parks Grant Fund for Local Parks
Source: state lottery; current biennium: \$5.0 million (statewide)
- (iii) Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery
Source: federal general fund; current year: \$28 million (nationwide)
- (iv) State Marine Board Facilities Grant
Source: recreational boat registrations and marine fuel taxes; current biennium: \$3.8 million (statewide)
- (v) County Opportunity Grant Program
Source: recreational vehicle registrations; current biennium: \$750,000 (counties only)

- (vi) National Trails Grants
Source: federal motor vehicle taxes; current year: \$740,000 (nationwide; 30 percent motorized trails, 70 percent other trails)
- (vii) Clean Vessel Act Grants
Source: federal marine fuel tax; current year: \$1.4 million (nationwide)

D. NEED FOR ACTION

D.1 Important But Limited Impact of 1995 Bond Measure. The Open Space, Parks and Streams Bond Measure approved by the region's voters in 1995 has enabled both Metro and the region's local governments to make timely, valuable acquisitions of land and access to parks and related lands and facilities in this metropolitan area. However, as promised to the voters, these acquisitions are limited to *natural areas only*. Also, by law the bond monies cannot be used to pay for operations and maintenance costs. Moreover, the bond measure should be viewed as only the first step in making the vision of the *Greenspaces Master Plan* a reality, particularly given that the region's population continues to grow. As such, although the 1995 bond measure has helped significantly in important ways, it has not provided sufficient funds to address the region's needs across the full spectrum of neighborhood, community, city, county, and regional parks and related lands and facilities. There continue to be substantial unmet needs at all levels throughout the region.

D.2 3,700 Acres Needed to Be Set Aside From 1998-2017 to Maintain "Status Quo" in Region. As addressed in Finding and Conclusion A.8, the most recent Metro update (in June 2000) of the *Urban Growth Report* projects that 3,700 acres of buildable land in the region will be acquired or otherwise dedicated to parks and related lands and facilities between the years 1998 and 2017. As discussed, this 3,700 figure is based on the assumption that as buildable land is developed in the region between 1998 and 2017, the same percentage of land will be set aside for parks and related lands and facilities as is currently set aside within the region's developed area. Although only an assumption that itself will not cause any land to be acquired or dedicated for parks purposes, this 3,700 figure can provide a useful insight into *approximately* how much land will need to be set aside within each local jurisdiction between 1998 and 2017 in order for the current percentage of land in use for parks and related lands and facilities to be maintained—i.e., in order for the status quo to be maintained within the urbanized area of the region. To this end, Table 1 allocates the 3,700 acres to each local jurisdiction in the metropolitan area based on the proportionate shares of the housing targets for 2017 currently set out in Title 1 of the *UGMFP*.

TABLE 1
ALLOCATION OF BUILDABLE LAND NEEDED TO BE
SET ASIDE IN PORTLAND REGION TO MAINTAIN
"STATUS QUO" OF PARKS AND RELATED LANDS AND
FACILITIES, 1998-2017, BY JURISDICTION, BASED ON
ALLOCATION OF HOUSING TARGETS IN UGMFP

| Jurisdiction | Absolute Number of Housing Units | Percent of Total | Proportionate Share of Acres for New Parks and Related Lands and Facilities |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Beaverton | 15,021 | 6.2% | 228 |
| Cornelius | 1,019 | 0.4% | 15 |
| Durham | 262 | 0.1% | 4 |
| Fairview | 2,921 | 1.2% | 44 |
| Forest Grove | 2,873 | 1.2% | 44 |
| Gladstone | 600 | 0.2% | 9 |
| Gresham | 16,817 | 6.9% | 255 |
| Happy Valley | 2,030 | 0.8% | 31 |
| Hillsboro | 14,812 | 6.1% | 225 |
| Johnson City | 168 | 0.1% | 3 |
| King City | 182 | 0.1% | 3 |
| Lake Oswego | 3,353 | 1.4% | 51 |
| Maywood Park | 27 | 0.0% | 1 |
| Milwaukie | 3,514 | 1.4% | 53 |
| Oregon City | 6,157 | 2.5% | 93 |
| Portland | 70,704 | 29.0% | 1,072 |
| River Grove | (15) | 0.0% | 0 |
| Sherwood | 5,010 | 2.1% | 76 |
| Tigard | 6,073 | 2.5% | 92 |
| Troutdale | 3,789 | 1.6% | 57 |
| Tualatin | 3,635 | 1.5% | 55 |
| West Linn | 2,577 | 1.1% | 39 |
| Wilsonville | 4,425 | 1.8% | 67 |
| Wood Village | 423 | 0.2% | 6 |
| Clackamas County | 19,530 | 8.0% | 296 |
| Multnomah County | 3,089 | 1.3% | 47 |

| Jurisdiction | Absolute Number of Housing Units | Percent of Total | Proportionate Share of Acres for New Parks and Related Lands and Facilities |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Washington County | 54,999 | 22.5% | 834 |
| TOTALS | 243,993 | 100.0% | 3,700 |

Although one may be tempted to question the assumptions and implications of the methodology used to create *Table 1*, the numbers set out in *Table 1* dramatically portray the *order of magnitude* need for new parks and related lands and facilities that the metropolitan area faces across the jurisdictions of the region. To be clear, the Subcommittee does not include *Table 1* in this report to convey or suggest that each local jurisdiction should acquire by 2017 the particular number of acres that are listed in the table for parks and related lands and facilities. Rather, the Subcommittee includes *Table 1* to emphasize the rough magnitude of the need for new parks and related lands and facilities in the region.⁷

D.3 Citizen Demand for "Green". Independent of numerical projections such as those set out in *Table 1*, the need for parks and related lands and facilities within the UGB has been increasingly emphasized by the citizens of this region as they see more and more "green" disappearing within their neighborhoods and communities. This phenomenon is due in part to the effects of growth generally but also is due in part to higher density infill and redevelopment occurring in the region. Even if inaccurate or unfair, certain citizens and interest groups and some local elected officials blame this growing problem on the implementation of the *Regional Growth Concept*. In reality, the problem is not due to the content of the *Regional Growth Concept* but rather due to the failure of the region to fully implement all elements of the *Regional Growth Concept*—especially those elements relating to parks and related lands and facilities.⁸ Absent timely action that results in more parks and related lands and facilities actually being

⁷ As explained in the Footnote 3, the 3,700 acres allocated by *Table 1* assumes that essentially the same percentage of buildable land developed within the UGB between 1998 and 2017 will be used for parks and related lands and facilities as the percentage of existing developed land within the UGB that currently is being used for parks and related lands and facilities. This suggests that areas of the region which currently are underserved by parks and related lands and facilities would continue to be underserved even if the acreages set out in *Table 1* were actually acquired or otherwise dedicated to parks and related lands and facilities by the year 2017. This outcome would be mitigated to some extent, however, because the definition of "parks" used by Metro staff in developing the 3,700-acre projection is an expansive one including more than parks and related lands and facilities as that term is used in this report. See footnote 4.

⁸ See Exhibit 1.

provided in the neighborhoods and communities of the region, citizen support for the *Regional Growth Concept*—and perhaps Metro itself—will increasingly be in jeopardy.

D.4 Public Plazas for Urban Centers. The need for additional parks and related lands and facilities, including town plazas and public squares, has been documented as part of the regional center, town center, and other planning efforts being undertaken to implement the *Regional Growth Concept*. For example, in the City of Portland citizen-based planning efforts for mixed-use centers at Gateway, Hollywood, Kerns, Lents, Hillsdale, Sellwood-Moreland, and Albina have all resulted in an identified need for a public square, "park block", or similar park enhancement to be incorporated into the center. Portland has experienced similar outcomes in its neighborhood planning along mainstreets identified in the *Regional Growth Concept*. In virtually all of these instances, Portland Parks and Recreation has little or no funding to pay for the public squares and other parks enhancements being advocated by the citizen planning committees and their staffs. Similar situations exist throughout the region, including in the town centers planned for Oregon City, Milwaukie, Troutdale, Sunset, and Raleigh Hills.

D.5 Critical Component of Livability. This region's citizens and their elected officials, reflecting Oregonians' special relationship with their environment, view neighborhood, community, city, county, and regional parks and related lands and facilities as a critical component of livability. To the extent we fail as a region to provide the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities, the quality of life in this metropolitan area will decline.

D.6 Documented Economic and Other Benefits. Numerous studies have documented the physiological, psychological, environmental, and economic benefits of parks and related lands and facilities, including but not limited to significant increases in property values of contiguous and nearby residential and commercial properties.

D.7 Cooperation and Coordination of Parks Providers. As the metropolitan area continues to grow and infill and redevelopment occur, meeting the demands for parks and related lands and facilities across the region will require increased and more effective cooperation and coordination between and among the region's park providers.

D.8 Aid to Meeting Environmental and Habitat Constraints. More parks and related lands and facilities, especially those emphasizing natural resource protection, will better equip this metropolitan area to respond to regulation and avoid constraints relating to endangered species, water quality, and similar habitat and natural resource concerns.

D.9 Chronic Lack of Adequate Resources. Given the problematic nature of existing approaches to funding,⁹ local and regional park providers—and their citizen-constituents—continue to experience a sustained, substantial, and pervasive lack of resources for parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area. This funding problem applies to all aspects of the provision of local and regional parks and related lands and facilities, namely: (i) planning, (ii) land acquisition, (iii) development of improvements and facilities, (iv) operations, and (v) maintenance. Absent action by all levels of government, including Metro, there is little reason to believe that this chronic problem of under-funding of parks and related lands and facilities in the region will be adequately addressed to maintain livability.

D.10 Limited Local Funding. Without a substantial change in local voters' priorities, the current outlook for increasing local funding for local parks and related lands and facilities in the region generally is not encouraging given local reliance on property taxes and general fund revenues. As local budgets tighten, competition with local demands for police, fire, schools, local transportation, and economic development will only heighten. Plus the combined effects that voter resistance to increases in property taxes, Measure 5 compression, and the Measure 50 double-majority requirement will have on local parks property tax measures are not likely to dissipate. Indeed, all local parks funding measures which appeared on the November 2000 ballot in the Portland metropolitan area were defeated by the voters. While there are varying theories to explain these defeats at the polls, the Subcommittee believes these outcomes more likely reflect voters' opposition to property tax increases than voters' lack of support for enhancements to local parks and related lands and facilities and related programs.

D.11 Limited Regional Parks and Greenspaces Operating Budgets. The level of recent operating budgets of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department has been inadequate to enable the Department to fully perform all of its existing responsibilities including maintenance of the properties acquired with 1995 bond measure proceeds. A portion of the Department's recent operating budgets has been paid for out of a fund balance. At the current draw-down rate, resources in the fund balance will be depleted in two to three years. Metro staff estimate that full funding of the Department's existing responsibilities without drawing on the fund balance would require an additional \$1.6 million annually. As such, unless significant new funding is made available, major reductions in the Department's existing programs will become necessary. Given this situation, a substantial increase in the Department's budget will be required to enable the Department to not only continue its current programs but also manage an expansion of its mission to address the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the region.

⁹ See section C of these Findings and Conclusions.

D.12 Lack of Funding for Development of Properties Acquired With 1995 Bond Proceeds. There is a substantial and growing problem of lack of funding for planning, development, and operations of the natural-area properties that have been and are being acquired by Metro with the 1995 bond monies. To date, approximately 6,400 acres of such natural areas have been acquired, creating the potential for up to 21 new regional parks and natural areas in the metropolitan area. Metro staff estimate that the cost of planning and developing these new sites for public use will be in the range of \$50-70 million, and that the operating cost for these sites once developed will be \$5.0-5.5 million annually. There currently is essentially no funding available to develop these sites for public use or to operate them after their development.

D.13 Cost of Developing Criteria and Goals Needed to Assess Capital Needs. As already discussed,¹⁰ the absence of regionally-adopted level of service criteria, goals, or other standards or benchmarks for the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area makes it impossible to describe in dollar terms the region's unfunded capital needs for such parks and related lands and facilities. The time and resources required to develop and adopt such level of service criteria, goals, or other standards or benchmarks, and to establish the unfunded capital cost of achieving those desired outcomes in the region, should not be underestimated. As a point of reference, Metro's preparation and adoption of the 2000 version of the *Regional Transportation Plan* took four years and more than \$4 million to complete.

D.14 Potential Impact of Measure 7. If the Measure 7 amendment to the Oregon Constitution ultimately is upheld and not repealed or modified (or if it is replaced by a similar measure), the need for action to achieve the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the region will be heightened. This will be the case because local zoning and other local regulatory approaches to maintaining natural areas, habitat, and other elements of the "green" within our communities may become financially infeasible.

D.15 Need for Concerted Action. Parks and related lands and facilities don't just happen. They require action—ultimately by governments and their citizens—to cause them to happen. Enhancing the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in this metropolitan area will require concerted action by Metro and the region's local governments to educate and mobilize the citizens of the region.

E. TRADEOFFS/CHOICES/POSSIBILITIES

E.1 Ongoing Central Role For Local Parks Providers. Whatever role Metro might play in addressing the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region, the fact is the vast majority of parks and related lands and facilities in this metropolitan area are funded, owned, and operated by local park providers. There are no

¹⁰ See Finding and Conclusion B.5.

reasons to believe that this state of affairs will, or should, change. Any actions taken to expand Metro's parks-related mission should acknowledge and be consistent with this reality.

E.2 Reallocation of Other Public Resources Not Feasible. The only available approach to significantly increasing expenditures for parks and related lands and facilities within existing governmental revenue levels would be to redirect funding from other public services such as police, fire, schools, transportation, and economic development. This does not appear feasible.

E.3 Competing Perspectives on Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals. There are competing perspectives regarding the relative advantages and disadvantages of regionally-adopted level of service standards or goals regarding parks and related lands and facilities.

E.3.1 Arguments in Favor of Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals. Advocates for regionally-adopted level of service standards or goals for parks and related lands and facilities argue that the existence of such standards or goals would provide both substantive justification and "political cover" for local park providers when dealing with the development community and others who oppose parks requirements. An example of this occurs when a developer objects to a neighborhood or community-scale park being required within a large development on the basis that the development abuts a city, county, or regional scale natural area. The existence of a set of regionally-adopted standards or goals could help justify and explain the need for the local-scale parks and provide political support to the local jurisdiction. Another example occurs when a local jurisdiction attempts to establish or increase a parks SDC. Again, the existence of regionally-adopted standards or goals could aid the local jurisdiction in justifying the establishment of or an increase in the SDC in order to better meet its needs for parks and related lands and facilities. Currently local jurisdictions frequently must not only make their own case for the parks SDC they propose, but also must explain why they need the particular rate of parks SDC they seek when other local jurisdictions in the region either have no parks SDC or a parks SDC at a lower rate. Advocates of regionally-adopted standards or goals also argue that they generally would serve to heighten awareness and stimulate action in the region regarding this important policy area.

E.3.2 Arguments in Opposition to Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals. Critics of regionally-adopted level of service standards or goals for parks and related lands and facilities, including many local park providers, are concerned that the regionally-standards or goals might call for fewer parks than they otherwise would want in their local jurisdictions. Should this happen, they foresee the regionally-adopted standards or goals being used to undercut both the justification of the need and the practical politics of the local jurisdiction's

efforts. Critics of regionally-adopted standards or goals also stress the fact that local parks generally are locally funded. As such, they wonder what would happen if local citizens did not want to pay for the local parks that were regionally "required". Another basic problem cited regarding regionally-adopted standards or goals is that the need for local parks and related lands and facilities varies from local jurisdiction to local jurisdiction—depending on demographics, topography, access to parks and natural areas outside the jurisdictional boundary, preferences of the jurisdiction's citizenry, etc.—and that local needs change overtime as demographics, development patterns, and societal preferences change.

E.4 Optional Applications of Regionally-Adopted Standards or Goals.

One possible resolution of the basic issue addressed in Finding and Conclusion E.3 would be for Metro to adopt standards or goals that were "model" standards or goals—meaning that a local park provider would be required only to (i) consider the Metro "model" standards or goals and (ii) thereafter adopt its own level of service standards or goals. Another possibility would be for Metro to condition a local park provider's receipt of future regional funds for local parks and related lands and facilities on the local park provider's having (i) considered Metro's "model" standards or goals and (ii) thereafter adopted its own level of service standards or goals. A related possibility would be for Metro to condition the local park provider's receipt of future regional funds for local parks and related lands and facilities on the local park provider's adoption of level of service standards or goals that were consistent with Metro's standards or goals.

E.5 Identification of "Regional" Irrespective of Ownership. One approach to addressing the full spectrum of regional parks and related lands and facilities in a metropolitan area that has not been fully utilized in this region is to identify and classify the inventory of parks and related lands and facilities existing throughout the region using consistent terminology regardless of ownership. In this way, certain parks and related lands and facilities that are owned and operated by a city or local park district but that nonetheless are of a regional scale or nature could be identified and classified as "regional" (without any transfer of ownership or management responsibility). This approach could be important for accurately assessing the full spectrum of existing regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities across the region. This approach also could be important should federal, state, or regional funds become available to pay for development, improvement, or maintenance of existing regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area, regardless of ownership.

E.6 Caveat Regarding Identification of "Regional" Irrespective of Ownership. Adopting the approach discussed in Finding and Conclusion E.5 of identifying and classifying "regional" parks and related lands and facilities regardless of their ownership should be undertaken with full awareness of the long history of the efforts it has taken to establish the degree of regional consensus that now exists

relating only to regional-scale natural areas and trails. Indeed, there presently are ongoing formal and informal discussions occurring pursuant to Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan* regarding the alternative meanings and effects that could result from regional-scale natural areas and trails not owned by Metro being identified and classified as "regional" and therefore as part of the Regional System. Absent a significant increase in political consensus being achieved within the region regarding this subject, the approach referenced in Finding and Conclusion E.5 likely should first be applied to regional-scale natural areas and trails and only thereafter to other regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities such as regional-scale active parks and recreational facilities.

E.7 User and Visitation Surveys of "Regional" Parks and Related Lands and Facilities. In recent discussions within this metropolitan area regarding the factors that should be considered in identifying and classifying natural areas that are part of the Regional System, both the "biological" and "social" characteristics of the particular area have been considered as criteria. Without this approach being abandoned, another factor that could be considered in identifying and classifying "regional" parks and related lands and facilities as referenced in Finding and Conclusion E.5 would be the results of user and visitation surveys that Metro could systematically conduct in collaboration with its local partners. This is an approach that has been used effectively in other metropolitan areas in support of regional parks systems.¹¹

E.8 Parks Land Acquisition Lending Bank. One possibility for Metro to consider with respect to local parks and related lands and facilities is the establishment of a parks land acquisition lending bank from which local parks providers could borrow to timely purchase needed parcels for parks and related lands and facilities when the opportunity existed and before acquisition costs escalated. The bank could be funded by a one-time regional bond levy and with other public, private, and nonprofit sector dollars. The local jurisdiction borrowing the funds from the bank would be required to pay back the loan, as local monies became available, pursuant to a loan agreement between Metro and the local jurisdiction.

E.9 Local Parks Providers' Use of Metro's Bond Rating. Another possible way that Metro could provide support for local parks and related lands and facilities

¹¹ For example, the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities metropolitan area of Minnesota has conducted periodic visitor surveys in that region's park system since 1978. (The Metropolitan Council does not own or operate any parks or related lands and facilities, including those classified as part of the "regional" system; all are owned and operated by local park providers.) The Metropolitan Council's survey work has assessed visitation levels and preferences across the regional park system, including parks, trails, and interpretive centers. The data collected have been used by the region's planners and decision-makers, particularly as the basis for establishing funding formulas for distribution of regional and state parks monies within the metropolitan area. A copy of a portion of *Twin Cities Regional Parks 1998 Summer Visitor Study Final Report* issued by the Metropolitan Council in August 1999 is attached as Exhibit 5.

would be to allow smaller local parks providers to use Metro's more favorable bond rating to more cost-effectively finance their local parks-related capital expenditures.

E.10 New Regional Funding. For Metro to effectively broaden its parks-related mission to address the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region, new regional funding will be required. Such additional regional funding will be needed to pay for Metro's direct costs and also for technical and financial assistance to local governments, for not only for parks-related capital costs (land acquisition and development) but also parks-related non-capital costs (planning, data collection and inventory work, research and analyses, operations, and maintenance).

E.11 Excise Tax on Solid Waste Tip Fee. One possibility for generating additional regional revenues to pay for planning, data collection and inventory work, research and analyses, operations, maintenance, and other non-capital costs of parks and related lands and facilities would be for Metro to increase its excise tax on the tip fee levied at its solid waste transfer stations. The logical nexus for such a tax would be that the solid waste stream collected at Metro's transfer stations represents a depletion and diminution of our region's land base and natural environment, on the one hand, and that our regional and local parks systems work to maintain and enhance that land base and natural environment, on the other. One attribute of Metro's excise tax applied to the region's solid waste stream is that it is a revenue source no other regional jurisdiction has available. Metro staff estimate that an addition 1 percent excise tax levied on the current tip fee at Metro's existing solid waste transfer stations would generate approximately \$600,000 to \$700,000 annually. The current tip fee, including Metro's excise tax, is the equivalent of \$62.50 per ton; in prior years this figure was as high as \$75 per ton.

E.12 Regional Funding Options. Other possibilities for generating additional resources at the regional level for capital and non-capital needs of parks and related lands and facilities include:

- (i) A nominal region-wide "park utility fee" paid by all residential, commercial, and industrial properties.
- (ii) A real estate transfer tax.
- (iii) A special niche tax.

- (iv) A region-wide serial levy for park planning, operations, and maintenance.¹²
- (v) A new regional bond measure for capital expenditures.¹³
- (vi) An annexation fee.

E.13 1995 Bond Measure Success. However daunting the task of generating new revenues to better fund parks and related lands and facilities in the region may seem, it is instructive to remember what can be accomplished when committed parks advocates, concerned citizens, and savvy political leaders join forces in appealing to voters. The 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure in the amount of \$135.6 million was passed by a region-wide yes vote of 64 percent yes, 36 percent no. This success followed a 1992 defeat of the predecessor regional greenspaces bond measure in the amount of \$200 million by a region-wide vote of 44 percent yes, 56 percent no. These very different outcomes from 1992 to 1995 are frequently explained by the following factors: the determination of the amount of the 1995 measure by aggregating the costs of a list of identified needs; the commitment to voters to use the 1995 bond proceeds only for specific regional and local projects that were listed and identified on maps; a heightened awareness of citizens in 1995 compared to 1992 of the increasing loss of the region's greenspaces due to growth; a more effective, better financed campaign in support of the 1995 measure; and—perhaps—the decrease in the amount of the bonds from \$200 million in 1992 to \$135.6 million in 1995.

E.14 November 2000 Parks Levy in Seattle. Acknowledging the typical, good natured (but healthy) skepticism of this region's residents regarding the civic achievements of our neighbors in the Puget Sound area, we nonetheless might also draw inspiration from the City of Seattle's success this past November in obtaining voters' approval of a \$198.2 million Neighborhood Parks, Greenspaces, Trails and Zoo Levy. Information regarding this November 2000 Seattle levy is attached as Exhibit 6. This eight-year, special municipal levy, which was passed by a vote of 55 percent yes, 45 percent no, will result in nearly \$200 million in new monies being allocated in four categories: (i) \$25 million for land acquisition for parks, greenbelts, and natural areas,

¹² Although the Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure approved by 64 percent of the region's voters in 1995 provided for the bonds to be repaid with a regional property tax levy, and although some property tax-funded local capital programs have received voter approval within the region since 1995, there continues to be substantial and seemingly increasing voter resistance to the use of the property tax as a means of funding public sector capital expenditures. As such, although use of the property tax to fund the capital needs of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region should not be discarded, alternative tax and revenue sources should be creatively identified and carefully considered.

¹³ See footnote 12.

(ii) about \$103 million for development of parks, playfields and facilities, and boulevards and trails, (iii) about \$61 million for maintenance and programming for parks, environmental stewardship, facilities, recreation, and the region's zoo, and (iv) \$10 million for a future acquisition and development fund. Interestingly, this successful 2000 Seattle measure followed a \$215 million King County Fields and Streams Bond Measure in 1996 which was defeated by a vote of 47 percent yes, 53 percent no, and a \$100 million City of Seattle Commons Park Levy in 1995 which was defeated by the same vote of 47 percent yes, 53 percent no. The approach taken to structure and market the successful November 2000 Seattle levy was based in part on lessons learned from the Portland region's 1995 bond measure—in particular, the ideas of determining the amount of the levy by aggregating the costs of a list of identified needs, making a commitment to voters to use the revenues generated only for specific projects that were listed and identified on maps, and appealing to voters through a targeted, community-based campaign.

RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 In cooperation with local governments, Metro should expand its current mission to help address the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the region. The Metro Council, in consultation with the region's local governments through MPAC and otherwise, should act to expand Metro's mission relating to the full spectrum of local, community, city, county, and regional parks and related lands and facilities within this metropolitan area as specifically set forth in these Recommendations. The Metro Council should take these actions in order to fully implement the spirit and the letter of the *Metro Charter*, the *RUGGOs*, the *Regional Growth Concept*, and the *Regional Framework Plan*; in order to maintain public support for implementation of the *Regional Growth Concept* generally and the *UGMFP* in particular; in order to maintain public support for Metro itself as our regional government; and ultimately in order to maintain and enhance the quality of life and livability of this metropolitan area.

1.2 Metro and local governments should raise the priority of parks and related lands and facilities in order to maintain and enhance livability within the region. With the involvement and support of the region's local governments, the Metro Council should take the specific actions recommended in this report so as to raise the relative importance and priority of parks and related lands and facilities in the region's overall planning and growth management effort. The Metro Council should do so with the objective of bringing parks and related lands and facilities up to par with such other critical regional policy and planning areas as land use, transportation, and environmental protection. The Metro Council should act as recommended because—at both the regional and local levels—our parks and related lands and facilities face on-going and substantial under-funding and inaction while new development and infill, the associated loss of "green" in our neighborhoods and communities, and the resulting diminution in our quality of life continue apace. The need for such action by both Metro and local parks providers will increase due to Measure 7, unless it is struck down, repealed, or modified, because of its impact on local zoning and other local regulatory approaches to maintaining the "green" within our region.

1.3 Metro should lead an effort to generate new regional resources for parks and related lands and facilities. In making the specific Recommendations that follow, the Subcommittee is mindful that their successful implementation will require Metro to generate significant new resources—both to fund Metro's own parks-related programs and to enable Metro to provide technical and financial assistance to the region's local parks providers. The Subcommittee believes that Metro and its local government partners can and must find a way to join forces to mobilize our regional community to support a new era of expanded funding for parks and related lands and facilities in this metropolitan area at this important time in our history. This effort should

be initiated immediately. The region's citizens are primed to support this kind of expanded regional effort to significantly enhance parks and related lands and facilities—if carefully conceived and adequately explained. Oregonians, including those of us who live in this metropolitan area, are wed to this beautiful place in which we live. We love our green landscape, and we want our children and grandchildren to be able to experience it first-hand. Consistent with these values, the 1995 bond measure acquisition program is viewed as the single most popular thing that Metro has done. For these reasons, the Subcommittee believes that the citizens of this region ultimately will support a major new parks and related lands and facilities effort if it is designed consistent with our values, if the funding and implementation scheme is fair and reasonable, and if these attributes are effectively communicated.

1.4 Metro should continue its efforts to make the vision of the Greenspaces Master Plan a reality. Metro has a unique responsibility to act to address the regional-scale aspects of our metropolitan area's parks and related lands and facilities. No other entity is in the position to address these issues as is Metro. Metro has made very substantial progress, over a considerable period of time and with some difficulty, in building a regional consensus and beginning to assemble the Regional System of regional-scale natural areas and trails envisioned in the *Greenspaces Master Plan* and described in Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*. The Subcommittee supports this effort and encourages its continuation, including the movement toward cooperatively incorporating into the Regional System those regional-scale natural areas and trails owned by local jurisdictions as well as those owned by Metro. The Subcommittee also supports the eventual expansion of this effort to include within the Regional System other types of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities, whether they be owned by local parks providers or Metro.

1.5 Metro should assist local governments with local parks and related lands and facilities. Metro also needs to act to assist its local partners in addressing the local aspects of this metropolitan area's parks and related lands and facilities. Our local governments are capable of acting and contributing to the solutions to the local dimensions of the problem, and they should be expected to do so. But the undeniable realities of Oregon's system of public finance result in our local parks providers being chronically constrained from solving the problem without assistance from other levels of government. Given the fundamental importance of parks and related lands and facilities in the *Regional Growth Concept* and their role in the region's livability, and given the *Metro Charter's* dictate that Metro's most important service is "to preserve and enhance the quality of life and the environment for ourselves and future generation", it is both appropriate and imperative that Metro act to assist local parks providers.

1.6 Metro should respect local prerogatives. In taking action to address not only the regional but also the local aspects of our metropolitan area's parks and related lands and facilities issues, Metro need not and should not invade the proper prerogatives of local governments. Indeed, Metro need not and should not make

decisions regarding local parks issues that are better and more appropriately made at the local level by local elected officials, local park staffs, and local citizens. Such an approach by Metro is neither necessary nor desirable, and is not reflected in the Recommendations of the Subcommittee.

1.7 MPAC and other local governments should encourage the Metro Council's favorable action on these Recommendations. MPAC and all local parks providers and other local governments in the metropolitan area should take action to encourage the Metro Council's acceptance and implementation of these Recommendations by (i) adopting and transmitting to the Metro Council a resolution of endorsement and support and (ii) encouraging citizens, community groups, businesses, and other organizations and interests to convey to the Metro Council their endorsement and support.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

2. Affirmation and Furtherance of Existing Regional Policies and Programs.

2.1 Metro should affirm and further existing regional policies and programs concerning parks and related lands and facilities. The Metro Council should affirm, clarify, and emphasize the fundamental importance of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in achieving the regional quality of life and community livability espoused in the *RUGGOs*, the *Regional Framework Plan*, and the *UGMFP*. This should be accomplished by:

2.1.A. Technical amendments to *Regional Framework Plan* relating to parks and related lands and facilities in land to be added to the UGB. The Metro Council should make technical amendments to Sections 3.5.7 and 3.5.8 of the *Regional Framework Plan* so that the language of those sections comports with the current realities of Metro's approach to urban reserve areas and the planning and development of lands to be added to the UGB. In so doing, Metro should not abandon the basic public policy that is reflected in the current text of Sections 3.5.7 and 3.5.8.

2.1.B. Affirmation of existing policy giving local jurisdictions relief from *UGMFP* requirements if thwarted by local actions to expand parks and related lands and facilities. The Metro Council should affirm and clarify the policy established in Metro Council Resolution No. 97-2562B, which provides that the Metro Council will allow exceptions to particular local jurisdictions' housing, employment, and other targets established in the *UGMFP* if the local jurisdictions can demonstrate their inability to meet the targets due to acquisition or dedication of buildable land for parks and related lands and facilities. In so doing, however, the Metro Council also should clearly communicate how the policy relates to the current *Urban Growth Report* which indicates that adequate

buildable land is available within the region to enable local jurisdictions to achieve their *UGMFP* housing and employment targets between the years 1998 and 2017 even after 3,700 acres are excluded from the buildable land inventory to account for acquisition or other dedication of land for additional parks and related lands and facilities.

2.1.C. Development and adoption of generalized criteria for level of service standards and of region-wide goals for the urban design types, for parks and related lands and facilities. Consistent with Section 3.5.8 of the *Regional Framework Plan*, the Metro Council should fund an effort by its Regional Parks and Greenspaces and Growth Management staffs, in cooperation with their local counterparts on GTAC and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee ("MTAC"), to jointly develop generalized criteria for level of service standards, and region-wide goals for the various urban design types, for parks and related lands and facilities in the region.

2.1.D. Technical and financial assistance to local governments for the development and adoption of their own level of service standards for parks and related lands and facilities. Upon completion of the tasks set out in item 2.1.C, the Metro Council should fund technical assistance by its Regional Parks and Greenspaces and Growth Management staffs as well as direct financial assistance to the region's local parks providers so as to aid them in developing and adopting their own local level of service standards and master plans for the local parks and related lands and facilities within their jurisdictions. This technical and financial assistance should be aimed at both (i) assisting local park providers with planning, acquiring, and developing local parks and related lands and facilities for the public uses and intrinsic values they provide and (ii) aiding local jurisdictions with integrating their parks and related lands and facilities into the local urban form in ways that help create a sense of place and community in town centers and regional centers and along mainstreets and that generally serve to enhance neighborhood and community livability—as determined by the local jurisdictions consistent with the *Regional Growth Concept*.

2.1.E. Continuation of efforts to create a Regional System of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities regardless of their ownership. Metro should continue its work toward creating an integrated Regional System of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities, regardless of their ownership. In so doing, Metro initially should continue its focus on regional-scale natural areas and trails, as envisioned in the *Greenspaces Master Plan* and described in Chapter 3 of the *Regional Framework Plan*. Thereafter, Metro should expand its focus to include other regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities such as regional-scale active parks and recreational facilities. In developing this Regional System, Metro

should utilize the information obtained from the user and visitation surveys advocated in Recommendation 4.2.

2.1.F. Continuation of efforts to encourage and facilitate partnering regarding parks and related lands and facilities. Metro should continue its efforts to encourage and facilitate partnering between and among the region's parks providers, other public agencies, nonprofit organizations, community groups, businesses, and citizens as a creative and cost-effective means of delivering parks and related lands and facilities.

3. A New UGMFP Parks Title, Modified Metro Department Roles, and A New Metro Advisory Committee.

3.1 Metro should add a new, limited parks title to the UGMFP. The Metro Council should add a new title to the UGMFP requiring cities and counties, as part of the process for reviewing development proposals, to assess and consider the extent to which the proposed development will (i) impact existing parks and related lands and facilities within the jurisdiction and (ii) be served by parks and related lands and facilities including any to be provided as part of the development. This new title of the UGMFP should also encourage but not require local jurisdictions, within such constraints as Measure 7 and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*,¹⁴ to consider (a) requiring developers to dedicate park land or money in lieu thereof as a condition of development approval, (b) setting parks SDC rates at levels based on actual acquisition and development costs for parks and related lands and facilities, and (c) enacting parks SDCs that are applicable to commercial development as well as residential development.

3.2 Metro should consider expanding the capacity of key Metro departments regarding parks and related lands and facilities. As available resources allow, the Metro Council should expand the capacity of the Regional Park and Greenspaces Department consistent with the broadening of Metro's park-related mission to address the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area. This expansion of staff capacity should be calculated to bring to bear the needed types and numbers of professional staff and other resources required for Metro to achieve its broadened parks-related mission. The Metro Council also should enhance the resources of Metro's Growth Management Department as feasible to enable that staff and program to perform its elements of Metro's broadened parks-related mission.

3.3 Metro should create a new Regional Parks Policy Advisory Committee. The Metro Council should reformulate the existing Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee so as to broaden its focus to include the policy issues involved in achieving the full spectrum of neighborhood, community, city, county,

¹⁴ See Recommendation 4.5.

and regional parks and related lands and facilities within this metropolitan area. Renamed the Regional Parks Policy Advisory Committee ("RPPAC"), the basic roles of the new committee should be to monitor, evaluate, enhance awareness, and make recommendations regarding ongoing efforts within the metropolitan area to establish and maintain the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities required for the quality of life and community livability espoused in the *RUGGOs*, the *Regional Framework Plan*, and the *UGMFP*. RPPAC should be staffed by the Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff and advised by GTAC as to parks and related lands and facilities issues per se, and by Metro's Growth Management staff and MTAC as to issues relating to the role of parks and related lands and facilities in achieving desired urban form. RPPAC should be involved in the collection, compilation, analyses, and issuance of the parks-related information referenced in Recommendations 4.1 through 4.5. All parks-related matters acted upon by the Metro Council should be subject to prior consultation with and advice from RPPAC.

4. Improved Information Regarding Parks and Related Lands and Facilities.

4.1 Metro should enhance the regional parks inventory. The Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department should do additional work to enhance the existing regional parks inventory so that:

- (i) the data are collected and analyzed in a way that reflects the nature of those parcels of parks and facilities that are multi-functional in nature;
- (ii) the data are aggregated by urban design type;
- (iii) the data can be used to identify and classify the full spectrum of existing parks and related lands and facilities within the region according to their purpose, scale, and service areas, regardless of current or future ownership or operation;
- (iv) historic and current data are compiled and analyzed to provide conclusions as to whether as a region we are or are not doing as well regarding parks and related lands and facilities as we were in prior decades, whether our system of adding parks and related lands and facilities in the region is or is not keeping up with growth, and whether as a region we are or are not doing as well regarding parks and related lands and facilities as comparable regions;
- (v) the data can be used to identify opportunities for expanding cooperation and coordination between and among the region's parks providers as a means of meeting needs for parks and related lands and facilities; and

- (vi) the data can be used by Metro to periodically prepare and publish a report on the status of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the region, as advocated in Recommendation 4.4.

4.2 Metro should conduct user and visitation surveys of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities. As part of its ongoing work toward creating an integrated Regional System of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities, Metro in cooperation with its local partners should initiate a program of periodic user and visitation surveys of those parks and related lands and facilities otherwise considered to be of a "regional" scale or nature, regardless of their ownership. Metro should model its user and visitation survey program after those of other regions that have used such approaches successfully, such as the program of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities of Minnesota.

4.3 Metro should produce periodic reports on the estimate of unfunded capital needs for the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region. Metro should determine and report to the citizens of the region its estimate of the unfunded capital needs for the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the metropolitan area. This estimate should be based on (i) the generalized level of service criteria and region-wide goals for parks and related lands and facilities in each of the urban design types jointly developed by the Regional Parks and Greenspaces and Growth Management staffs and their local counterparts on GTAC and MTAC,¹⁵ (ii) local park providers' estimates of the unfunded capital needs for local parks and related lands and facilities within their own jurisdictions, as formally determined and submitted to the Metro Council by the city council, county board, or other governing body of the local park provider, (iii) the enhanced regional parks inventory data, and (iv) Metro's estimates of the costs of planning and developing regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities within the region, regardless of ownership, including the properties that have been and are being acquired by Metro with the proceeds from the 1995 bond measure.

4.4 Metro should produce every five years a "report to the region" on the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region. As soon as practicable, Metro should prepare and release a "report to the region" on the status of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities within the region. Thereafter, the report should be updated and reissued every five years. Each such five-year "report to the region" should include information regarding: (i) the establishment and formal adoption by local parks providers of level of service standards and jurisdiction-wide master plans for local parks and related lands and facilities, (ii) the extent to which local planning efforts for regional centers, town centers, mainstreets, and other urban design types identify the need for public squares, "parks blocks", or similar parks enhancements, and the availability of funding to meet those needs, (iii) the

¹⁵ See Recommendation 2.1.C.

availability of resources for regional and local parks and related lands and facilities within the region, by jurisdiction, (iv) the number, nature, and location of regional-scale parks and related lands and facilities, regardless of ownership, and the status of their development, and (v) the general level of achievement of level of service standards and of implementation of master plans for regional and local parks and related lands and facilities throughout the region.

4.5 Metro should perform and disseminate legal and other analyses relating to the limits of governmental authority concerning parks and related lands and facilities. Metro should perform on an on-going basis legal and other analyses, and should periodically report its findings and conclusions to the region's local parks providers, regarding the limits of governmental authority given such constraints as Measure 7 and *Dolan v. City of Tigard* to (i) require developers to dedicate park land or money in lieu thereof as a condition of development approval, (ii) set parks SDC rates at particular levels based on actual acquisition and development costs for parks and related lands and facilities, and (iii) enact parks SDCs applicable to commercial as well as residential development.

5. Increased Regional Funding for Parks and Related Lands and Facilities.

5.1 Metro should consider creating a parks land acquisition lending bank for use by local parks providers. Metro should explore the feasibility of establishing a land acquisition lending bank from which local parks providers could borrow to timely purchase needed parcels for parks and related lands and facilities when the opportunity existed and before acquisition costs escalated.¹⁶

5.2 Metro also should consider allowing smaller local parks providers to use Metro's more favorable bond rating to finance their parks-related capital expenditures. Metro should explore the feasibility of establishing a program under which smaller local parks providers could utilize Metro's higher bond rating to finance their capital expenditures for parks and related lands and facilities.

5.3 Metro should commence and lead an effort toward achieving significant new regional funding for the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the metropolitan area. The Metro Council should immediately initiate an effort to collaborate with local park providers and other local governments, advocates of parks and related lands and facilities, community leaders, and citizens throughout the region to determine the relative advantages and disadvantages of the optional approaches to generating significant and timely additional regional resources in support of the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities in the metropolitan area—for both capital and noncapital expenditures as described in this report. In so doing, the Metro Council should consider the funding possibilities set out in Findings

¹⁶ See Finding and Conclusion E.8.

and Conclusions E.11 ad E.12. The Metro Council also should determine and evaluate the amounts and timing of the new regional funding required to implement the various Recommendations made by the Subcommittee.

5.4 Metro should assure accountability regarding new funding generated. Whatever form or forms new regional revenue sources for parks and related lands and facilities might take, the Metro Council should take steps to assure accountability to the region's voters and taxpayers. The Subcommittee is mindful of the accountability measures built into the implementation of the 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams Bond Measure which have assured that voters received what they were promised. On the other hand, the Subcommittee is also aware that after Oregonians voted in 1998 to supplement and expand financial support for Oregon State Parks with lottery proceeds, certain budgetary actions were taken that reduced support from other traditional funding sources to the extent that the impact of the new funds was substantially diminished. In this regard, the Subcommittee wishes to underscore its intent in advocating new funding in these Recommendations. That is, the Subcommittee is recommending a significant increase in regional funding for regional and local parks and related lands and facilities in this metropolitan area—not a replacement for existing regional and local funds. To this end, the Metro Council should take steps to assure that new funds, when they become available, are used to supplement and enhance current resources for parks and related lands and facilities at both regional and local levels.

5.5 Metro and local governments should encourage continued funding of state and federal parks programs. As they collaborate to increase regional funding, the Metro Council, MPAC, and other local parks providers and local governments in the region should affirmatively encourage the Legislative Assembly and Oregon's Congressional Delegation to support continued if not increased funding for state and federal grant programs which leverage regional and local investments in parks and related lands and facilities.

EXHIBITS

1. *RUGGOS AND REGIONAL GROWTH CONCEPT; EXCEPTED PROVISIONS ON PARKS AND RELATED LANDS AND FACILITIES*
2. *CHAPTER 3 OF REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN*
3. *METRO COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 97-2562B AND RELATED MEMORANDUM OF METRO EXECUTIVE OFFICER MIKE BURTON*
4. *LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS, CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL PARKS PROVIDERS*, dated February 23, 2000, prepared by GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
5. *EXCERPTED PORTION OF TWIN CITIES REGIONAL PARKS 1998 SUMMER VISITOR STUDY FINAL REPORT* dated August 26, 1999, issued by METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (TWIN CITIES OF MINNESOTA)
6. *INFORMATION REGARDING SUCCESSFUL NOVEMBER 2000 CITY OF SEATTLE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS, GREEN SPACES, TRAILS AND ZOO LEVY*

**EXHIBIT 1
MPAC PARKS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

**RUGGOS AND REGIONAL GROWTH CONCEPT;
EXCEPTED PROVISIONS ON PARKS AND
RELATED LANDS AND FACILITIES**

RUGGOS

The *RUGGOS* include numerous goals, objectives, and planning activities relating to the role to be played by parks and related lands and facilities in the region's future. For example:

"The region's growth will be enhanced by . . . maintaining a compact urban form, with easy access to nature." *RUGGO Goal II, item III*

"Sufficient open space in the urban region shall be acquired or otherwise protected and managed to provide reasonable and convenient access to sites for passive and active recreation." *RUGGO Objective 15.*

"Quantifiable targets for setting aside certain amounts and types of open space shall be identified." *RUGGO Objective item 15.1.*

"Identify areas within the region where open space deficiencies exist now, or will in the future, given adopted land-use plans and growth trends, and act to meet those future needs. Target acreage should be developed for neighborhood, community and regional parks, as well as for other types of open space in order to meet local needs while sharing responsibility for meeting metropolitan open space demands." *RUGGO Objective 15 Planning Activity 1.*

"Reduce negative impacts [of the regional transportation system] on parks, public open space, wetlands and negative impacts on communities and neighborhoods . . ." *RUGGO Objective subitem 19.2.3.*

"The identity and functioning of communities in the region shall be supported through . . . the recognition and protection of critical open space features in the region." *RUGGO Objective item 25.1.*

"The identify and functioning of communities in the region shall be supported through . . . ensuring that incentives and regulations guiding development and redevelopment of the urban areas promote a settlement

pattern which . . . provides access to neighborhood and community parks, trails and walkways, and other recreational and cultural areas . . .," *RUGGO Objective subitem 25.iii.c.*

"A regional landscape analysis shall be undertaken to inventory and analyze the relationship between the built and natural environments and to identify key open space, topographic, natural resource, cultural and architectural features that should be protected or provided as urban growth occurs." *RUGGO Objective 25 Planning Activity 1.*

Regional Growth Concept

The *Regional Growth Concept* also addresses the conceptual role of parks and related land and facilities in the region. For example:

"Recognition and protection of open spaces both inside the UGB and in rural reserves outside urban reserves are reflected in the Growth Concept. Open spaces, including important natural features and parks, are important to the capacity of the UGB and the ability of the region to accommodate housing and employment." *Regional Growth Concept at RUGGO page 26.*

"The areas designated open space on the Concept map are parks, stream and trail corridors, wetlands and floodplains, largely undeveloped upland areas and areas of compatible very low density residential development . . . Local jurisdictions are encouraged to establish acres of open space per capital based on rates at least as great as current rates, in order to keep up with current conditions." *Regional Growth Concept at RUGGO page 28.*

"Designating . . . areas as open spaces would have several effects. First it would remove these land [sic] from the category of urban land that is available for development. The capacity of the UGB would have to be calculated without these, and plans to accommodate housing and employment would have to be made without them." *Regional Growth Concept at RUGGO page 28.*